

C. REMARKS

In response to the non-final Office Action dated May 12, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-22 will be pending in this application with claims 1, 14, 19, 20 and 22 being independent. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

1. 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to further limit claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 4 to recite “said display visually indicates the overall quality of signal as a bar graph.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

Claim 11 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for lacking proper antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 11 to recite “a junction box.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

Claims 14-18 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for lacking a clear distinction between the “indicator means” and the “display means.” Applicants have amended claim 14 to recite “indicator means coupled to said signal assessment means for providing indicator signals indicating the degree of alignment between the antenna and the signal transmitting device, wherein said display means visually displays the BER value, the C/N value, and the overall

quality of signal simultaneously in response to said indicator signals.” Applicants have amended claim 15 to recite “said indicator means provides visual indicators signal including text and graphic information that is indicative of the degree of alignment between the satellite and the signal transmitting device.” Applicants have amended claim 16 to recite “said indicator means provides an audio indicator signal that is indicative of the degree of alignment between the satellite and the signal transmitting device.” Applicants have amended claim 17 to depend from claim 16 and recite “said indicator means provides visual indicator signals including text and graphic information that is indicative of the degree of alignment between the signal transmitting device and the antenna.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

Claim 19 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for lacking clarity with respect to “the visual indication.” Applicants have amended claim 19 to recite “said display visually displays the BER value, the C/N value, and a visual indication of the degree of alignment between the antenna and the satellite based on the calculated overall quality of signal simultaneously.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

2. Fogelstrom/Fukazawa et al. Rejection

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over EP1014481 to Fogelstrom ("Fogelstrom") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,376,941 to Fukazawa et al. ("Fukazawa"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Fogelstrom teaches a portable set connected with the satellite receiver or TV set for acquiring signal quality information. *See* Fogelstrom at [0020]. According to Fogelstrom, an Automatic Gain Control (AGC) signal is measured and displayed to indicate a "rough" antennae alignment. *See* Fogelstrom at [0028]. Fogelstrom teaches that in some cases, AGC acquisition and display is unnecessary. *See* Fogelstrom at [0029]. After the AGC measurement has been performed, Bit Error Ratio (BER). Is measured and displayed to clarify signal quality. *See* Fogelstrom at [0029]. Fogelstrom also teaches graphically reproducing a single signal indicator or unified sequence based on AGC and BER. *See* Fogelstrom at [0038]. The single signal is generated by switching to BER measurement after AGC measurement has been detected with certainty. *See* Fogelstrom at [0038].

Fukazawa teaches an indoor antenna direction adjusting apparatus including a control device for adjusting the antenna direction on the basis of the C/N level. *See* Fukazawa at col. 2, ll. 6-17. According to Fukazawa, the user observes a level meter displaying the C/N level and stops the antenna when the meter has reached a maximum deflection. *See* Fukazawa at col. 5, ll. 33-39. The user then may perform fine tuning using a key input to further change the antenna position. *See* Fukazawa at col. 5, ll. 39-43.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 14, 19, and 20 to recite visually displaying the BER value, the C/N value, and the overall quality of signal simultaneously.

Applicants submit that the Fogelstrom and Fukazawa do not teach or suggest simultaneously displaying the BER value, the C/N value, and an overall quality of signal based on the BER value and the C/N value, as recited by independent claims 1, 14, 19, 20, and 22. In fact, both Fogelstrom and Fukazawa teach methods in which rough tuning (ACG or C/N) is performed initially and fine tuning is performed only after the rough tuning has been completed. As such, even if Fogelstrom and Fukazawa could be combined, which Applicants do not admit, such a combination fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 14, 19, 20 and 22.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the teachings of Fogelstrom and Fukazawa are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-22 and that claims 1-22 are allowable for at least this reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

3. **Holliday et al. / Shintani / Fogelstrom or Shigihara et al. Rejection**

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over International Application WO 00/24083 to Holliday (“Holliday”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,299,480 to Shintani (“Shintani”) and either Fogelstrom or European Patent Application EP000818923A2 to Shigihara et al. (“Shigihara”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 14, 19, and 20 to recite visually displaying the BER value, the C/N value, and the overall quality of signal simultaneously.

As admitted by the Examiner, Holliday does not teach or suggest an overall quality of signal based on a BER value and a C/N value. *See* Office Action at p. 4. Consequently, Holliday cannot teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 1, 14, 19, and 20.

Shintani teaches using information pertaining to C/N and AGC level only when BER information is unavailable. *See* Shintani at col. 5, ll.30-48. As such, even if Holliday and Shintani could be combined, which Applicants do not admit, such a combination fails to teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 1, 14, 19, 20 and 22.

As described above, Fogelstrom teaches a method in which rough tuning (ACG) is performed initially and fine tuning (BER) is performed only after the rough tuning has been completed. As such, even if Holliday, Shintani, and Fogelstrom could be combined, which Applicants do not admit, such a combination fails to teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 1, 14, 19, 20 and 22.

Shigihara teaches displaying multiple, quality indicators on a TV receiver. *See* Shigihara at col. 1, ll. 44-48 and col. 4., ll. 6-11. Shigihara, however, does not teach or suggest generating and displaying an overall quality of signal based on a BER value and a C/N value. As such, even if Holliday, Shintani, and Shigihara could be combined,

which Applicants do not admit, such a combination fails to teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 1, 14, 19, 20 and 22.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the teachings of Holliday, Shintani, and Fogelstrom or Shigihara are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-22 and that claims 1-22 are allowable for at least this reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

D. CONCLUSION

Applicants submit this application is in condition for allowance and request favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 11, 2004

Robert V. Racunas, Jr.
Robert V. Racunas, Jr.
Reg. No. 43,027
(412) 355-6279

Kirkpatrick & Lockhart LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Tel: (412) 355-6500
Fax: (412) 355-6501